

## **REMARKS**

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rupp (U.S. Patent 5,261,460), in view of Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0037812); and provisionally rejected claims 30-36 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of copending application no. 10/422,708.

By this amendment, Applicants propose to cancel claims 25-29.

In the Office Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 30-36 under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of copending application no. 10/422,708. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have attached a Terminal Disclaimer, with regard to application no. 10/422,708, to this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 30-36 in condition for allowance. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

charge the fees to Deposit Account 06-0916. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to Deposit Account 06-0916

The undersigned is an attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 5, 2007

By: 

Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921